

A

LETTER

TO

THE HONOURABLE

SIR DAVID DALRYMPLE,
LORD HAILES,

ON HIS

REMARKS

ON THE

HISTORY OF SCOTLAND.

EDINBURGH:

Printed by BALFOUR & SMELLIE.

M,DCC,LXXIII.



A

L E T T E R, &c.

MY LORD,

THE pleasure and instruction every man of curiosity must receive from your Lordship's late publication, justly entitles you to the acknowledgements of your countrymen; and, however considerable the merit of the performance may be in point of learning and composition, what ought to weigh most with the public is, your endeavours to revive that spirit of inquiry into the antiquities of this country, which, to our shame, was almost totally extinguished; and which, if it was possible to abolish, would at once destroy the most powerful incitement to private virtue and public spirit.

To pretend that such inquiries are of little consequence at present, is the language

guage of confessed insensibility, and may be equally applied to every other branch of historical science. It is surely of less importance to us, what happened 2000 years ago in Greece and Rome, than in our own country at a less remote period. And the gentlemen who pique themselves on the former branch of knowledge, while they remain ignorant in the latter, put one in mind of a fine lady, thoroughly versant in all the scandal of the town, but totally in the dark as to the concerns of her own family.

Every man who really loves his country, will be anxious about the past, as well as the present reputation of it; and will find his self-love interested in its most remote concerns.

Your Lordship has, in this last, as well as in many of your former publications,

set

set an example which must find admirers, and, it is to be hoped, will produce imitators.

These are my real sentiments with relation to the general merits of your remarks; and I flatter myself, if I venture to express some doubts in the many knotty subjects so critically treated of by your Lordship, you will not only pardon me, but will consider me as endeavouring to contribute my mite towards the promoting that spirit of inquiry, which alone animated you in your truly learned observations.

C H A P. I.

YOUR Lordship sets out by hinting, that the pretended alliance between Achaius and Charlemagne is *a silly fable*,

de-

destitute of historical evidence ; and you tell us, the only cotemporary writer quoted for proof of it is Eginhart.

If Eginhart is the only cotemporary writer of reputation that exists, it ought not to seem surprising, that he is the only one quoted to prove it. But you admit his *authority as undoubted* : The only question then is, Whether he says enough to establish the existence of this alliance ? He certainly does, in the very passage quoted by your Lordship, p. 2. It is literally this : *Charlemagne, by means of his munificence, had got the kings of the Scots so disposed to comply with his inclinations, that they constantly pronounced themselves his subjects and servants. Letters of theirs to this purpose do now exist.*

This implies as much as ever was asserted by any Scots author of character.—For-

dun

dun could not pretend to have seen the parchment. Writings of the 8th century did not reach the 14th.

The question never was about the terms of the treaty ; but, Whether there ever did exist a treaty between Charlemagne and the king or kings of Scotland ? Had the Scots antiquaries been so absurd, as to put their kings and Charlemagne on a footing of equality, your conclusion would have been just. Those who have supported the opinion of that alliance against Rymer, and such English as have denied the existence of it, only mention, that there actually was a communication or intercourse of friendship or protection, and of mutual good offices, between the kings of Scotland and Charlemagne. A Wurtemburgher has a right to say, there was an alliance between the D. of Wurtemburgh and the king of

Eng-

England, though the terms were, that the Duke should receive money, and, in return, should furnish troops. Nor is it absurd in a Genevois to quote the treaty by which the king of France obliges himself to protect Geneva, as a treaty of alliance.

Rymer, the very author who calls in question the authenticity of our alliance with Charlemagne, furnishes evidence for an alliance between the king of England and the Lord of the Isles, though no author has had the folly to put the Lord of the Isles on a footing with the king of England. Our treaty with the Cherokees is an alliance.

Your Lordship admits that *missi* or *nunci*, as quoted by Fordun from Alcuin's letter to Offa, were sent by Charlemagne to the kings of the Scots; you honour these *missi* with the title of *Ambassadors*; and

and you conjecture that the subject of their *embassy* was religious. That, indeed, is more than probable; for all the undertakings of Charlemagne, that have reached our knowledge, are of that nature. The cruelties he exercised against the Saxons were to convert them to Christianity; it was in religious obedience to the pope that he destroyed the excommunicated Lombards. Religion was a more universal cloak in the days of Charlemagne than at present. But still the question is not, Whether the subject of the alliance was civil or religious? but, whether an alliance ever existed?

You mention Eginhart as the only authority quoted for this alliance; and, as I confess myself very little versed in the literary history of the eighth century, I looked into Vossius, for the history-writers of that

B period,

period, and find the only writers of name were Eginhart and Alcuin ; the first, chancellor and biographer to that great prince ; the other, his governor. Your Lordship quotes both ; and we have the authority of both, for an intercourse of friendship between Charlemagne and the kings of the Scots : Ambassadors were sent by Charlemagne, and subsidies bestowed, with returns of civility. This is as much as the nature of the thing can admit of ; and proves the Scots alliance to be *something more than a silly fable.*

Vossius quotes Suffridius Petri, who mentions Hanco Forteman, a Friseland writer of the eighth century, ‘ quem consignasse, ‘ ait, expeditiones a se susceptas sub impe- ‘ ratore Graeco, rege Scotiae, Angliaeque, ‘ et Karolo Magno.’ It seems the king of Scotland appeared in good company, in
the

the history of those days. *Vossius de script.*

Latin. lib. 2. cap. 32.

You observe, that Eginhart does not mention Achaius by name, but *reges Scotorum.*

It is the alliance with the Scots, not with a particular man, that is contended for; but *reges Scotorum* does not exclude Achaius. The intercourse was likely to continue with his successor. Besides, Achaius never was sole king of the Scots, since, by your note, p. 3. the Irish passed under that denomination, *anno 812*; and the Pictish monarchy subsisted long after, tho' the whole was then called Scotia.

I cannot help differing from your Lordship, in thinking that Abercromby translates the words *subditi* and *subjecti*, in the passage alluded to in Eginhart, with propriety, that is, as words of course, and

mere

mere terms of courtesy. For it is not pretended, that the Scots were, in reality, subjects of Charlemagne ; the quotation itself excludes that construction. Eginhart cites that expression, in proof of their friendship and affection, not of their necessary dependence.

The proof Mr Goodall brings, in his preface to *Fordun*, that there was an established opinion, *anno 1308*, of an antient alliance, is certainly decisive for the purpose for which he brings it. He employs it to confute Rymer, in his assertion, that the alliance was never heard of till John Baliol, or Robert II. Besides, the mandate of Charlemagne, quoted by Goodall, tho' treated by your Lordship, p. 31. with contempt, proves, past a doubt, that the Scots had privileges bestowed upon them as a nation by Charlemagne and his predecessors.

cessors. It is likely, something was to be performed on their part, or we must suppose Charlemagne a singular bubble; if so, the bargain was an alliance in every sense of the word. Johnson's definition of Ally is, ' One united by some means of connection.'

It would be hard to strip the Scots of the ostentation of this alliance, because that silly disclaimer, Hector Boece, has made it the ground-work of a fable.

It is to be observed, that the memory of this alliance was first revived by the French, *anno 1308*, who call upon the Scots for performance, and not the Scots on them. *Introduct. ad Fordun.* p. 69.

C H A P. II.

YOUR remarks on Lord Lyttelton, p. 90. *et sequent.* have demonstrated, that the dispute about the independency of Lothian still remains undetermined, after all his Lordship's endeavours to clear it up; and yet one cannot help leaning to my Lord's opinion.

Who that considers the geography of this country, and what we know of the history of those times, can doubt, that the kingdom of Northumberland was once bounded by the Forth? If so, does it not remain probable, that the Saxon kings of all England would keep up their pretensions to the sovereignty of it? And since we admit, that we held some provinces of

Nor-

Northumberland as feudal *, is it not incumbent on us to bring proof, that Lothian was none of them?

Maitland's history of Edinburgh, p. 144. recites the original charter of foundation of Holy Rood House, *anno 1128*, where Edinburgh is repeatedly called *Edwinesburch*. The same book, p. 7. quotes Simeon of Durham, who calls it *Edwinesburch*, *anno 854*. This creates a strong presumption, that the town was Saxon.

The position your Lordship lays down, p. 45. will hardly be admitted in its full extent, viz. *that the same rule of judging ought to take place in a curious, as in an important question.*

In the first case, one ought often to decide on probability, or presumptive evidence; the later generally requires positive proof.

* Ford. I. 8. c. 3.

proof. In the first case, it is enough the thing is likely; in the last, it ought to be made appear that it cannot be otherwise.

Suppose we were to recover, amongst the ruins of antiquity, a map of the kingdom of Northumberland as old as the ninth century, comprehending Lothian within the limits of it; such a discovery would go far to convince me, that Lothian had once made part of it: But, if I was to decide on the point of right, I should require a more incontestible authority than that of a map, before I gave it against the possessor.

C H A P. III.

THOUGH I differ widely from good Bishop Spottiswood, as to the prophetic powers of Thomas the Rymer, I could have wished to have been informed, upon what ground your Lordship lays it down as a received opinion, that kindred ends at the tenth generation. I doubt much if the Welch and Highlanders will subscribe to this rule.

It is impossible to read a page, of Spotswood's history, without being convinced, that he was the best meaning, and the most sincere of all men; but it is equally impossible to finish a chapter, without lamenting, that so worthy a man had so weak a head. He is every where a retailer of Buchanan's prejudices, from want of judge-

ment. I have been long in use to quote what he says of Thomas the Rhymer, in proof of the weakness of his understanding; and yet, my Lord, I am convinced, that, weak as he was, he knew that Thomas the Rhymer was a Papist; and if any body had pointed out to him the line your Lordship mentions, where he compliments the virgin Mary with the title of Queen of Heaven, it would not have affected the good Bishop's opinion of him as a prophet.

C H A P. IV.

YOUR Lordship hath vindicated Edward III. from the imputation of poisoning Randolph Earl of Murray. All such vague accusations, though countenanced even by Tacitus, ought to be treated with contempt.

This

This country owed too much to the virtue of that great man, to suffer him to die a common death, like one of the vulgar. In the zeal of our gratitude we could do no less, than sacrifice the honour and good name of Edward III. to his *manes*. If the compliment is not quite in the stile of *Æneae magni dextra cadi*, it is better suited to the violence of our resentment. I consider this tale as a monument to the popularity of that nobleman, erected to dazzle the mob, to whom it was adapted, and too transparent to impose on any body else.

C . H . A . P . V .

TF David II. preferred the interest to the glory and honour of his people, we ought not to wonder, that he proposed to unite

unite them with the English, by settling the succession on a son of their king. How different were the sentiments of the Scots in 1370, and in 1705!

In chapter 6. your Lordship brings an imputation of bastardy against the most illustrious branch of the family of Douglas. I confess, that, in all the evidence you bring to support it, I cannot perceive a single argument to justify this singular opinion.

You quote Froissart, p. 123. ; but Froissart says nothing to favour your system. On the contrary, the passage you quote makes it evident, that the Archibald Lord of Galloway he speaks of, could not possibly succeed to the earldom of Douglas.

You quote Bowmaker, in p. 128. ; but nothing can be more repugnant to Bowmaker's expression and sentiments, Little did

did the poor man suspect, when he was liberally adorning one Archibald Douglas with the accumulated trappings of three of the same name, that he was exposing him to an imputation of bastardy.

You make use of Froissart, to prove this singular anecdote from Bowmaker; and of Bowmaker, to prove it from Froissart: Though neither the one nor the other had any suspicion of it themselves.

It must be acknowledged, this method of proof has something particularly ingenious in it. But, admitting it as good logic, and that this meaning can be squeezed out of Bowmaker; you found the whole charge on the single passage in that writer, quoted in p. 128. The question then is, Whether Bowmaker's unsupported authority is of weight to establish so improbable an event, as that the brother of Earl James,

and

and all the descendants of that noble family, did tamely submit to give up their honours and inheritance to a bastard ; and all this without a single complaint, murmur, or reproach, amidst the various warm contests that soon took place among the different branches of the family ; and in opposition too (as you allow) to the unanimous assertion of all the genealogical writers of this country ?

Bowmaker was a monk, mewed up in his convent ; and was so extremely ill informed, as to be ignorant of the most public occurrences in the families of the very kings under whom he lived, and had his education. It is Bowmaker who makes Robert II. marry Elizabeth Muir 30 years after her death ; and bastardises Robert III. under whom he passed a great part of his life,

life, in defiance to the most solemn and public declarations of the legislature.

Home of Godscroft warms us against this error of Bowmaker: He tells us, there were three Archibald Douglasses, often confounded by historians; that Archibald, called the Grim, succeeded to his brother, James of Otterburn, in the year 1388, and had the year before succeeded to Archibald Lord of Galloway, who died *anno* 1387. The epithet of Grim is constantly applied to Archibald 3d Earl of Douglas; and never was applied to Archibald first Lord of Galloway.

Personal descriptive epithets were, and still are employed, to distinguish men of the same name. If we are to suppose the first Lord of Galloway, and Archibald who succeeded James of Otterburn, the same person; why is he universally known by
the

the epithet of Grim, when Earl of Douglas, and never once called so during thirty-two years that we hear of him, from the battle of Poitiers, to his succession after Otterburn?

Froissart, it is true, did not know that Earl James had a brother: But it is past a doubt, that George Earl of Angus was his brother. Since Froissart's ignorance of George is confessed, it would be more than begging the question to deny the existence of Archibald, because Froissart was not acquainted with it.

Contemptible as the authority of Bowmaker is, he seems to me guiltless of the blunder ascribed to him. It is probable the words which have given occasion to this confusion about the three Archibald Douglasses (*viz. qui postea fuit Dominus Galweiae et comes de Douglas*) have been added

by

by a transcriber. What confirms me in this opinion is,

1st, They are superfluous, and even impertinent in that place *.

2^{dly}, They are evidently in the stile and form of a note ; and, in one of the MS. copies, there is a further avowed interpolation, *viz. hic Archibaldus dicebatur Grym* ; p. 129.

3^{dly}, It would have been even below Bowmaker to have given this abridgement of Archibald's future history, *anno 1356*,

D and

* ' Captus etiam ibidem fuit Archibaldus de
 ' Douglas, filius nobilissimi domini Jacobi, qui
 ' cum corde inclitissimi Regis Roberti Bruce a
 ' Paganis extinctus est ; qui postea fuit dominus
 ' Galweiae et comes de Douglas ;' *Fordun.*
 I. xiv. c. 16.

and to have said nothing relative to it, in summing up his character with so much pomp, *anno 1400.*

4thly, It is impossible that the character given by Froissart, of Archibald Lord of Galloway (quoted by you, p. 125. and 126.) and that of Fordun, p. 130. can belong to the same man.

Fordun's man was brave indeed, but splendid; a man of business, and religious.

Froissart's, a strong, warlike chevalier, dealing deadly blows with an instrument no two men could wield; the terror of the English.

Page 137. you demand where, and on what occasion did he distinguish himself by his *fortitudo et audacia?* I answer, that the most daring attempt ever subject succeeded in, was his forcing his own daughter upon the heir of the crown, after he

was

was betrothed to the daughter of the Earl of March, and her fortune paid down. If we can suppose Archibald first Lord of Galloway, and Archibald the Grim the same person, he must have been much above 70 when Buchanan bewails his death as premature. His father good Sir James died *anno* 1330.

C H A P. VIII.

YOUR Lordship's generosity in becoming champion for Mary of Gueldre is highly commendable: But, on that plan, I think you had as well have let Pitscottie remain in his error; since the scandal he threw out against Margaret ought not to affect the character of Mary.

C H A P.

C H A P. IX.

WHEN Keith and Principal Robertson assert, that the reformers could devise nothing stronger, than the act of 11th April 1567, their views went no farther than to the security of their own religion. Those authors did not think toleration incompatible with the establishment of the protestant religion; nor did they imagine it necessary for the security of the reformation, to extirpate those who differed from them. And indeed it is most indecent in Spottiswood to join in this declaration against toleration.

It happens often in Ireland, that, not content with all the security which could be devised at the revolution, for the protestant religion, bills are brought into parliament,

liament, intituled, ‘ For the more effectual security of protestants ;’ but containing only clauses for the persecution of papists. Those bills are always rejected by the king and council of England, to the great discontent of many zealous protestants, who, not satisfied to go to heaven themselves, insist on sending to hell all such as differ from them.

C H A P. X.

I Shall not presume to follow your Lordship in your critical examination of the evidence for and against the corporeal beauty or deformity of Bothwell.

The ideas of men as to the *το καλόν*, are so various, and the rules for deciding are so very defective, that, if Bothwell was now alive,

alive, and had done nothing to prejudice the world against him, it is likely the dispute about his beauty might still remain undetermined.

I beg to be indulged, if I enter more minutely into the discussion of the latter part of this chapter, where you decide against those who suppose, *that Bothwell was entering into the vale of life, when he became acquainted with the young and beautiful MARY.*

That last opinion is founded on the positive assertion of Buchanan, whose authority, in a fact that passed in a manner under his eye, when his faculties were in their full force, and where he had no prejudice to gratify, must ever justify such as suffer themselves to be determined by it.

That elegant historian assures us, that, in the year 1544, James Earl of Bothwell was professed rival to the Earl of Lennox,

then

then a youth, in their addresses to Mary of Guise.

‘ Mattheus Stuartus Leviniae Comes. Huic juveni, in ipso juventae flore ;’ Buch. lib. 15. cap. 8.—‘ accessit aemulus Jacobus Heburnus, Comes Bothueliae. Is eiusdem artibus Reginae viduae nuptias ambiebat. Eminebant in utroque naturae et fortunae dotes, magis similes quam aequales : Itaque, cum Bothuelius, caetera pene par ; in omni autem certamine, et armorum ludicra meditatione esset inferior.’ Id. l. 15. c. 12.

Thus we have the testimony of Buchanan, an eye-witness, that James Earl of Bothwell was similar to Lennox in the year 1544 ; and, of course, that Bothwell, and Lennox, whom Buchanan describes as in the dawn of youth, (in ipso juventae flore,) were of an age. We have a

right

right then to maintain, from the above passage in Buchanan, that James Earl of Bothwell, who married Mary in 1567, was as old as Lennox the father of Darnley, and old enough to make love to Mary's mother in the year 1544: And, surely, if we are to bestow any degree of credit on historical evidence, no fact ever was more uncontestedly established. But, however well founded this opinion may be, your Lordship brings evidence, which, by all the laws of criticism, must be admitted as sufficient to overturn it, if found to be irreconcilable with it.

Patrick, the father of Bothwell, you have proved, died *anno* 1556. Mary writes, that Bothwell was very young immediately after the death of his father; therefore he could not be the James Earl of

of Bothwell described by Buchanan *anno*
1544.

But the votaries of Buchanan deny your conclusion. They say, that Mary, in her apology for marrying Bothwell, may be supposed to represent him as a very young man, *anno* 1556, tho' he might have made love to her mother, *anno* 1544.

Mary's instructions to her ambassador, on which you found your argument, are too long to be inserted here; the words of them that relate to Bothwell's age are:

‘ The report as it is indeid, swa fall ye
 ‘ mak it in yis maner. Bygynand from
 ‘ his verie zouth, and first entres to yis
 ‘ realme, imediatlie aftir the deceis of his
 ‘ fader.—Ze fall not omit his service in the
 ‘ weris aganis Ingland, quairin he gaif sic
 ‘ pruif of his vailzeantnes, courage, and
 ‘ guide conduct, that, notwithstanding he

' was then of verie zounge aige, zit was he
 ' chosen out as maist fit of the haill nobi-
 ' lity to be our Lieutenant-general upon
 ' the bordours, having the hail charge, as
 ' weil to defend as to assayle,' &c.

These instructions were for the bi-
 shop of Dunkeld, her ambassador to
 France.

If the bishop, in compliance with them,
 had addressed himself to the French court
 in the following words, I ask if he must not
 have been allowed to have obeyed the
 Queen's commands, and to have explained
 her meaning ?

" The world had so high an opinion of
 the valour of the Earl of Bothwell, that
 tho' he was not two and thirty at the
 death of his father, and had no opportu-
 nity of making interest, having just come
 from abroad; yet so conspicuous was his

superiority,

superiority, that, young as he was, he was singled out, from amongst all the nobility of Scotland, as the fittest person for the command of the army on the borders against the English."

Surely, my Lord, this is Mary's tale, and all her tale; (Vide Anderson, vol. 1. page 89.) and is neither inconsistent with itself, nor with Buchanan. Why then strain it to lessen the authority of that respectable author, and to introduce an historical scepticism?

But, when we consider with attention the whole of these instructions of Mary, as published by Anderson, every sentence demonstrates them to have been dictated by Bothwell, whose prisoner Mary then was. Mary neither would nor could have written them in English, since they were for

for the use of a person who must have understood French.

It is remarkable, the style is without a Gallicism ; and, by altering the spelling, and changing a few obsolete words, would be elegant English at this day ; and, in that respect, is extremely different from every Scots production of that period, Liddington's compositions not excepted.

The writing then on which your Lordship founds, is Bothwell's, not Mary's. And though perfectly agreeable to Buchanan, yet, if it differed from him, a candid critic would deliberate before he decided against the positive authority of that respectable author, on the faith of a panegyric on Bothwell, written by himself on such an occasion, and addressed to people at a distance, to whom he was little known, and whom his vanity had an interest to mislead.

The whole force of your Lordship's argument is reduced to this. Bothwell says, in Mary's name, that he was a very young man, for a general in chief, at a period when Buchanan makes him two and thirty: Therefore Buchanan's authority ought to pass for nothing.

But Earl Patrick may have died in the year 1556; and Earl James may be indulged in representing himself as a very young man at that time; and yet may have been old enough, in the year 1544, to have aspired to the love of Mary of Guise. All these are consistent, and not improbable: But, if we admit your Lordship's hypothesis, inconsistencies, and even impossibilities, stare us in the face at every step.

If we suppose Buchanan guilty of a misnomer, and Patrick the father of James to have

have been the rival of Lennox, he could not have been in any respect similar to him, or on a par with him, in his pretensions to the hand of the Queen-dowager; for Lennox was a very young man, *in ipso flore juvenae*, and never married, (B. 15. c. 20.); but Patrick Earl of Bothwell had been banished seven years before, for corresponding with England, (B. 1. 14. c. 53.) and, if he aspired to marry the Queen, he must have been a widower, and father of a son eight years old at least; for we find his son James at the head of an army, when he defeated an English convoy, destined for Leith, *anno 1559*; therefore, we cannot suppose him less than seven or eight, *anno 1544*.

No part of Buchanan's narrative can be so tortured, as to apply to Patrick the father of James. Buchanan then must either

ther mean James, when he mentions him by name, or the whole story of the rivalry must be a fiction.

Your Lordship's hypothesis, with all its inconsistencies, makes Bothwell at least 32 when he married the Queen. Buchanan makes him 43 at the utmost. Let any impartial man judge whether the whole story of Bothwell, from the year 1558, that he raised the siege of Leith, till his marriage with the Queen in 1567, is most in the style of an experienced profligate between 32 and 43, or of a boy between 22 and 32.

Conscious there is an intricacy and want of perspicuity, inseparable from all reasoning drawn from comparison of dates, I beg leave to repeat my argument.

Your Lordship draws two conclusions from Mary's instructions joined with Bothwell's

well's service, or act of succession to his father, *anno 1556.*

1st, You say, they prove, That James Earl of Bothwell, who married Mary in 1567, could not be the person meant by Buchanan who wanted to marry her mother *anno 1544.*

2dly, That Patrick, the father of James Earl of Bothwell, whom you have proved to have died *anno 1556*, must have been the person meant by Buchanan.

I hope I have made it appear, that your Lordship's first inference does in no respect weaken the evidence of Buchanan, since a ' *juvenis in ipso flore juventae,*' *anno 1544,* could only be a young man *anno 1556.* And I flatter myself I have demonstrated, that your Lordship's second inference is impossible: For Patrick the father of James was certainly old enough to deserve ban-

nishment

nishment *anno 1537*; and must have been a married man as early as the year 1534 at furthest; since he had a lawful son born in wedlock, who succeeded to his honours and estate *anno 1556*, and was immediately put at the head of the army.—And, of course, if he proposed to marry the queen *anno 1544*, he must have been a widower, loaded with a son and heir; and therefore he could not possibly be the person described by Buchanan, as *similis* and *par* to Lennox *juvenis in ipso flore juventae*; which last words I translate, ‘A lad in the ‘dawn or blossom of youth.’ *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

A gentleman of taste, to whom I communicated the above, encourages me to believe, your Lordship will not persist in thinking thirty-two too old for a general, since you think it young enough for a lover.

It is no new discovery, that Patrick lived many years after his son's rivalship with Lennox. Ruddiman mentions this in his notes. But as Buchanan, on this occasion, points out James by name, his meaning seems to have been to prevent any mistake with relation to the person he was speaking of ; especially, as it is in that instance only that he mentions the Christian name of any Earl of Bothwell, and omits that of Lennox. 'Tis true, James was not actually Earl of Bothwell while his father lived ; but it is usual to ascribe to a man, under the acquired title he is chiefly known by, the actions of his youth. Thus, we say, Augustus prevailed at Philippi, tho' he was not Augustus till several years after ; the Prince of Conde won the battle of Rocroi, tho' then only Duc d'Enguienne..

C H A P. XI.

I Shall not add to the Marian Controversy, as you are pleased to term it, by giving my opinion about the authenticity of the sonnets; but I cannot help differing from your Lordship as to the merit of the verses of Mary you quote from Brantome: They seem to me elegant in the highest degree. This is altogether a matter of taste, and therefore an improper subject of argument. The numbers are certainly soft and flowing. The subject is a lamentation on the death of her husband Francis II. king of France. Few verses can bear a literal translation. In English, Mary's verses are:

If I lift my eyes to heaven, I trace his lovely
features in every cloud.

But * soon the watry scene below represents him
to me in his grave.

Here I must conclude my grievous complaint,
The uninterrupted tenor of which shall be,

Love, like mine, sincere and undisguised, can ne-
ver be diminished by separation.

Word for word, it is as follows.

If at times I address my looks towards the
heavens,

I see the sweet glances of his eyes in a cloud.
All of a sudden I see him in the water, as in
a grave.

Song,

* Every palace in France was surrounded
with water.

Song, put an end here to this most grievous complaint; the constant conclusion of which shall be,

Love sincere, and not feigned, because of separation,

Shall have no diminution.

Si par fois vers les cieux
 Viens addreſſer ma veue,
 Le doux trait de ces yeux
 Je vois en une nue;
 Soudain le vois en l'eau,
 Comme dans un tombeau.
 Mets, chanſon, icy fin
 A ſi triste complainte,
 Dont ſera le refrain,
 Amour vraye et non feinte
 Pour la ſeparation
 N'aura diminution.

The verſes of Charles IX. would ſeem *naïve* to me, if it was poſſible to ſeparate the verſifier from the maſſacrer.

CHAP.

C H A P. XII.

IN the conclusion your Lordship draws from King James's very illegal commission for hanging a man, for an offence not capital, I beg to put you in mind of your just observation, page 198.

“ Next to the passions of man, I know not any thing which has so fatally checked the growth and progress of truth, as that prejudice, which tries every fact and custom related in history by the standard of our own manners.”

The English could hardly take alarm from an exertion of absolute power in their favour; since it will not be contested, that, at that very time, they *actually* felt

felt all the weight of it under Queen Elizabeth.

The proper inference to be brought from this piece of history is, that the English had not at that time acquired their relish for liberty; not that King James did not know how to court their favour.

C H A P. XIV.

I Cannot think the probability of the valuable acquisition of the history of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster so very desperate, if the only obstacles are those pointed out by your Lordship. Since, I dare say, they are no longer the object

object of hate ; were too powerful and too sanguinary to be liable to contempt ; and I believe never were the subject of admiration.

C H A P. XVIII.

AS you justly observe, the certificates of Sir Thomas Livingstone, now published by your Lordship, are certainly the material part of the letter to my Lord Dundee ; and that letter is henceforth to be considered as Sir Thomas's, not Lord Strathnaver's.

Whatever my Lord Dundee may have imagined of the state of affairs, it was impossible for him to deliberate about rejecting the terms offered him.

Without

Without being a politician, the weakest man living must have seen at once, that it was impossible to treat, without giving up the cause ; and that even the suspicion of a correspondence on that subject was equal to a surrender at discretion. He could not expect, that any Highlander would have remained with him, if he had discovered the least diffidence of success. When the chiefs begin to treat, it is full time for the followers to take care of themselves.

My Lord Dundee must have considered this proposal as a snare to ruin him with the vulgar ; and, in common prudence, could only write what he wished them to believe, so as the publishing his answer might not destroy the hopes of his party.

P. S. I flatter myself, that I shall be considered as contributing more to the diminution than to the bulk of the Marian contro-

verfy, by directing the public to a book much quoted by Bayle. It is entitled, ‘*Les Lessones diverses de Louis Guyon, conseiller aux finances au Roi de France.*’ The edition I have seen of this book is printed at Lyons, chez Abraham Claque-man, in 3 vols, 12mo, anno 1613. The author, speaking of himself, uses these words: ‘*Etant en Ecosse, j’ai bien connu David Rizzio, duquel j’ai reçu bien de courtoisies à la cour: Il étoit assez agé et laid, d’une humeur morgne et mauvais plaisir; mais d’une rare prudence, et fort habille dans les affaires.*’ The words in Italics, I wrote down; the others I quote from memory: But I can rely on the material part of the exprefſion.

The book I saw is in the poſſeſſion of my very learned friend Mr Carmichael at London.

I point out this author for the instruction of the genius who presides over Strawberry-hill, that English Parnassus, from whose lofty summit he has deigned to throw out the gauntlet of defiance against all the world, challenging them to produce an authority for the old age of Rizzio.

F I N I S.